JOURNAL OF CLINICAL ONCOLOGY

RUNX1 Mutations in Acute Myeloid Leukemia: Results From a Comprehensive Genetic and Clinical Analysis From the AML Study Group

Verena I. Gaidzik, Lars Bullinger, Richard F. Schlenk, Andreas S. Zimmermann, Jürgen Röck, Peter Paschka, Andrea Corbacioglu, Jürgen Krauter, Brigitte Schlegelberger, Arnold Ganser, Daniela Späth, Andrea Kündgen, Ingo G.H. Schmidt-Wolf, Katharina Götze, David Nachbaur, Michael Pfreundschuh, Heinz A. Horst, Hartmut Döhner, and Konstanze Döhner

See accompanying article on page 1373

A B S T R A C T

Purpose

To evaluate frequency, biologic features, and clinical relevance of *RUNX1* mutations in acute myeloid leukemia (AML).

Patients and Methods

Diagnostic samples from 945 patients (age 18 to 60 years) were analyzed for RUNX1 mutations. In a subset of cases (n = 269), microarray gene expression analysis was performed.

Results

Fifty-nine *RUNX1* mutations were identified in 53 (5.6%) of 945 cases, predominantly in exons 3 (n = 11), 4 (n = 10), and 8 (n = 23). *RUNX1* mutations clustered in the intermediate-risk cytogenetic group (46 of 640, 7.2%; cytogenetically normal, 34 of 538, 6.3%), whereas they were less frequent in adverse-risk cytogenetics (five of 109, 4.6%) and absent in core-binding-factor AML (0 of 77) and acute promyelocytic leukemia (0 of 61). *RUNX1* mutations were associated with *MLL*-partial tandem duplications (P = .0007) and *IDH1/IDH2* mutations (P = .03), inversely correlated with *NPM1* (P < .0001), and in trend with *CEBPA* (P = .10) mutations. *RUNX1* mutations were characterized by a distinct gene expression pattern; this *RUNX1* mutation-derived signature was not exclusive for the mutation, but also included mostly adverse-risk AML [eg, 7q-, -7, inv(3), or t(3;3)]. *RUNX1* mutations predicted for resistance to chemotherapy (rates of refractory disease 30% and 19%, P = .047, for *RUNX1*-mutated and wild-type patients, respectively), as well as inferior event-free survival (EFS; P < .0001), relapse-free survival (RFS, P = .022), and overall survival (P = .051). In multivariable analysis, *RUNX1* mutations were an independent prognostic marker for shorter EFS (P = .007). Explorative subgroup analysis revealed that allogeneic hematopoietic stem-cell transplantation had a favorable impact on RFS in *RUNX1*-mutated patients (P < .0001).

Conclusion

AML with *RUNX1* mutations are characterized by distinct genetic properties and are associated with resistance to therapy and inferior outcome.

J Clin Oncol 29:1364-1372. © 2011 by American Society of Clinical Oncology

INTRODUCTION

The identification of mutations—for example, in the nucleophosmin 1 (*NPM1*) gene, the fms-related tyrosine kinase 3 (*FLT3*) gene, the CCAAT/enhancer binding protein alpha (*CEBPA*) gene, the myeloid-lymphoid or mixed-lineage leukemia (*MLL*) gene, the neuroblastoma RAS viral oncogene homolog (*NRAS*) gene, the Wilms tumor (*WT1*) gene, and most recently the isocitrate dehydrogenase 1 (*IDH1*) and 2 (*IDH2*) genes in acute myeloid leukemia (AML)—has significantly improved our understanding of leukemogenesis.¹⁻⁸ Some of these mutations have been shown not only to provide important prognostic information, but also to represent potential targets for molecular therapies.^{9,10} In addition, by the application of genome-wide gene expression profiling (GEP), gene signatures have been identified that separate AML into previously unrecognized biologic and/or prognostic subsets.¹¹⁻¹³

The runt-related transcription factor 1 (*RUNX1*) gene is another candidate targeted by chromosomal rearrangements or intragenic mutations in acute leukemia.¹⁴⁻²² Recurrent translocations involving *RUNX1* include t(8;21)(q22;

From the University Hospital of Ulm, Ulm; Hannover Medical School; Institute of Molecular and Cellular Pathology, Hannover Medical School, Hannover; University Hospital of Düsseldorf, Düsseldorf; University Hospital of Bonn, Bonn; Technical University of Munich, Munich; University Hospital of Saarland, Homburg; University Hospital Schleswig-Holstein, Kiel, Germany; and University Hospital of Innsbruck, Innsbruck, Austria.

Submitted May 31, 2010; accepted November 29, 2010; published online ahead of print at www.jco.org on February 22, 2011.

Supported by Grants No. 01GI9981 (Network of Competence Acute and Chronic Leukemias) and 01KG0605 (IPD-Meta-Analysis: A Model-Based Hierarchical Prognostic System for Adult Patients With Acute Myeloid Leukemia) from the German Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung and Grant No. R 08/32f from the Deutsche José Carreras Stiftung e.V.

Authors' disclosures of potential conflicts of interest and author contributions are found at the end of this article.

Corresponding author: Konstanze Döhner, MD, Department of Internal Medicine III, University Hospital of Ulm, Albert-Einstein-Allee 23, 89081 Ulm, Germany; e-mail: konstanze.doehner@ uniklinik-ulm.de.

© 2011 by American Society of Clinical Oncology

0732-183X/11/2910-1364/\$20.00

DOI: 10.1200/JCO.2010.30.7926

q22); *RUNX1-RUNX1T1* or t(3;21)(q26.2;q22); *EVI1-RUNX1* in AML, and t(12;21)(p13;q22); *ETV6-RUNX1* in childhood acute lymphoblastic leukemia.²³ Somatic mutations clustering within the Runt domain of *RUNX1* have been described in myelodysplastic syndrome and AML.¹⁶⁻²⁰ Of note, inherited mutations of *RUNX1* were identified as a cause of the autosomal familial platelet disorder that predisposes to the development of MDS and AML.^{24,25}

In initial studies, *RUNX1* mutations have been associated with undifferentiated morphology (French-American-British [FAB] M0) and with specific chromosome aberrations, such as trisomy 21 and trisomy 13.^{17,18,21} In a recent study of 156 cases with AML, highly selected for specific FAB and cytogenetic subgroups,²¹ *RUNX1* mutations were detected in almost half (46%) of FAB M0 cases and in 80% of cases exhibiting trisomy 13. So far, only one study has been published reporting frequency and clinical significance of *RUNX1* mutations in an unbiased cohort of patients with AML (15 to 90 years of age).²² In this study of 470 Taiwanese adult patients with AML, *RUNX1* mutations were found in 13.2% of patients. Mutations were associated with a lower complete remission (CR) rate and with inferior disease-free survival (DFS) and overall survival (OS).

Runx family proteins were found to have an essential role in the regulation of gene expression by, for example, temporal transcriptional repression and epigenetic silencing via chromatin alterations, especially in the context of chromosomal translocations.²⁶ These findings might have therapeutic implications as the *RUNX1*-associated gene deregulation and hematopoietic differentiation block might be effectively targeted by epigenetic therapeutic approaches.

The objectives of our study were to evaluate the frequency and clinical impact of *RUNX1* mutations in the context of cytogenetic and molecular genetic markers in a large cohort of younger adult patients with AML entered onto prospective clinical trials of the German-Austrian AML Study Group (AMLSG). To gain further insights into the biology of *RUNX1*-mutated AML, GEP was performed in a subset of cases.

PATIENTS AND METHODS

Patient Samples

Diagnostic bone marrow (BM) or peripheral blood (PB) samples from 945 patients with AML (age 18 to 60 years) were analyzed. Patients were enrolled onto two consecutive AMLSG multicenter treatment trials: AML HD98A (n = 651; NCT00146120) and AMLSG 07-04 (n = 294; NCT00151242). Treatment details of the protocols are given in the Appendix (online only). Patients with acute promyelocytic leukemia (APL) were treated in the APL HD 95 trial.²⁷ All patients gave informed consent for treatment and genetic analysis according to the Declaration of Helsinki.

Cases were molecularly studied for the presence of the recurring gene fusions *RUNX1-RUNX1T1*, *CBFB-MYH11*, *MLL-MLLT3*, and *PML-RARA* (either by fluorescence in situ hybridization or polymerase chain reaction [PCR]) and for gene mutations in *FLT3* (internal tandem duplications [ITD] and tyrosine kinase domain [TKD] mutations at codons D835 and 1836); *NPM1*; *MLL* (partial tandem duplication [PTD]); *IDH1* and *IDH2* (analyses restricted to the AML HD98A trial, n = 642); and *CEBPA*, *NRAS*, and *WT1* (analyses of the latter three in cytogenetically normal [CN] AML only) genes.^{6,28}

Analysis of RUNX1 Mutations

The entire coding region of *RUNX1* (exons 1 through 8) was amplified by PCR using intron-exon flanking primer pairs and subjected to direct sequencing according to standard protocols (Appendix Table A1; online only). PCR reactions and sequencing analyses were repeated in all cases showing sequence variations.

In addition, PB samples from 29 healthy volunteers were analyzed for the presence of *RUNX1* polymorphisms. In 18 of the 53 mutated AML cases, germline material (DNA obtained from buccal swabs or from BM in CR) was studied for the presence of *RUNX1* germline mutations. Finally, all *RUNX1* sequence variations were aligned to different single nucleotide polymorphism databases²⁹⁻³¹ to detect known polymorphisms.

GEP Profiling

For a subset of AML HD98A cases with available high-quality RNA (n = 269), GEP was performed as previously described using cDNA microarrays.³² The complete GEP data set is also accessible at gene expression omnibus (GEO accession GSE23312). For data analysis, fluorescence ratios were normalized as described,³² and for all subsequent analyses, only differentially expressed clones were included.

Statistical Analyses

The statistical analyses for GEP as well as for the clinical outcome analyses are provided in the Appendix. $^{\rm 33-41}$

RESULTS

Frequency and Types of RUNX1 Mutations

Fifty-nine *RUNX1* mutations were identified in 53 (5.6%) of 945 cases (Appendix Table A2; online only). Mutations clustered in exon 3 (n = 11), 4 (n = 10), and 8 (n = 23), but also occurred in exon 5 (n = 5), 6 (n = 7), and 7 (n = 3). There were six cases with two concurrent *RUNX1* mutations. Most of the mutations were frameshift mutations as a result of insertions or deletions (n = 44), but in 15 cases we also detected single nucleotide substitutions (two nonsense, one silent, 12 missense mutations). All mutations were heterozygous. There were 26 mutations in 21 patients within exons 3 to 5; among them 14 were predicted to lose the DNA-binding domain RHD because of generating a stop codon. Regarding the mutations of exons 6 to 8 involving the transcriptional activation domain, 21 of 33 mutations in 31 patients might result in a truncated RUNX1 protein.

In 23 patients with AML, we found a sequence variation at amino acid codon 56 (L56S) in exon 3 that was recently described as polymorphism.⁴² This polymorphism was not detected in 29 healthy volunteers, but occurred in nine of 18 germline samples that have been tested. In contrast, in none of the 18 germline samples the respective gene function altering mutation was found.

Association of RUNX1 Mutations With Clinical Characteristics, Cytogenetics, and Other Molecular Markers

RUNX1 mutations were mainly found in the cytogenetic intermediate-risk group (46 of 640, 7.2%), most commonly in CN-AML (34 of 538, 6.3%) and in AML with trisomy 8 within a noncomplex karyotype (five of 36, 14%; Table 1); the frequency in the high-risk group was lower (five of 109, 4.6%), and no mutations were found in core-binding-factor AML (0 and 77) and APL (0 and 61). Because APL did not exhibit *RUNX1* mutations and patients were treated differently, patients with APL were excluded from further analyses.

RUNX1 mutations were associated with the presence of *MLL*-PTD (P = .0007) and *IDH1/IDH2* mutations (P = .03; *IDH1*^{R132}, n = 7; *IDH2*^{R140}, n = 4; *IDH2*^{R172}, n = 1), but inversely correlated with *NPM1* mutations (P < .0001). No significant associations were

Gaidzik et al

| Table 1. Pretreatment Clinical Characteristics, C | rtogenetic Risk Group Assignment, N | Molecular Features, a | nd Outcomes According to | RUNX1 Mutational |
|---|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|------------------|
| Status in all AML (APL excluded) | | | | |

| | RUNX1 Mutated (n = 53) | | <i>RUNX1</i> Wild-Type (n = 831) | | | |
|------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|------|--------|--|
| Characteristic | No. | % | No. | % | Р | |
| Age, years | | | | | .42 | |
| Median | 4 | 8.1 | 48 | 3.2 | | |
| Range | 19 | 9-60 | 18 | -60 | 10 | |
| Male sex | 31 | 59 | 442 | 53 | .40 | |
| AML history | 45 | 05 | 707 | 00 | .10 | |
| | 45 | 68 | /6/ | 92 | | |
| Therepy related | 5 | 9 | 27 | 3 | | |
| $WBC count \times 10^{9/l}$ | 3 | 0 | 32 | 4 | /1 | |
| Median | 1 | 3 1 | 17 | 7.6 | .+1 | |
| Bange | 0.9- | 235.0 | 0.2-427.0 | | | |
| Platelet count $\times 10^{9}/l$ | 0.0 | 200.0 | 0.2 - | 27.0 | 99 | |
| Median | | 51 | Ą | 6 | .00 | |
| Bange | 6- | 242 | 2-7 | 746 | | |
| Hemoglobin, g/dL | | | | | .64 | |
| Median | 8 | .95 | 8. | 90 | | |
| Range | 4.8 | -13.6 | 3.0- | 17.6 | | |
| Blood blasts, % | | | | | .69 | |
| Median | 4 | 1.5 | 4 | .0 | | |
| Range | 0 | -98 | 0-1 | 00 | | |
| Bone marrow blasts, % | | | | | .34 | |
| Median | 8 | 30 | 7 | 4 | | |
| Range | 20 | -100 | 2-1 | 00 | | |
| FAB classification* | | | | | | |
| MO | 5 | 16 | 28 | 6 | .04 | |
| M1 | 7 | 23 | 85 | 17 | .47 | |
| M2 | 4 | 13 | 157 | 32 | .03 | |
| M4 | 8 | 26 | 135 | 27 | 1.0 | |
| M5 | 6 | 35 | 63 | 13 | .28 | |
| M6 | 1 | 2 | 13 | 3 | .58 | |
| M7 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 2 | 1.0 | |
| Missing | 9 | | 59 | | | |
| Cytogenetic risk group | 0 | 0 | | 0 | .02 | |
| Favorable | 0 | 0 | // | 9 | | |
| Intermediate | 46 | 8/ | 594 | 72 | | |
| | 54 | 04 | 104 | 12 | | |
| Missing | 2 | 5 | 56 | 15 | | |
| Specific cytogenetic abnormalities | 2 | | 50 | | | |
| Monosomy 7† | 0 | | 36 | | | |
| Trisomy 8‡ | 5 | | 31 | | | |
| Trisomy 13§ | 1 | | 4 | | | |
| Trisomy 13‡ | 1 | | 3 | | | |
| Trisomy 21§ | 1 | | 8 | | | |
| Trisomy 21‡ | 0 | | 8 | | | |
| Abnl(12p) † | 3 | | 18 | | | |
| NPM1 | | | | | < .001 | |
| Wild-type | 48 | 91 | 515 | 63 | | |
| Mutated | 5 | 9 | 307 | 37 | | |
| FLT3-ITD | | | | | .87 | |
| Absent | 39 | 75 | 593 | 73 | | |
| Present | 13 | 25 | 216 | 27 | | |
| FLT3-TKD | | | | | .42 | |
| Wild-type | 47 | 96 | 704 | 91 | | |
| Mutated | 2 | 4 | 68 | 9 | | |
| | (co | ntinued on tollowing pag | e) | | | |

 Table 1. Pretreatment Clinical Characteristics, Cytogenetic Risk Group Assignment, Molecular Features, and Outcomes According to RUNX1 Mutational

 Status in all AML (APL excluded) (continued)

| Characteristic | RUNX1 Muta | RUNX1 Mutated (n = 53) | | <i>RUNX1</i> Wild-Type (n = 831) | |
|----------------|------------|------------------------|-----|-------------------------------------|-------|
| | No. | % | No. | % | Р |
| MLL-PTD | | | | | .0007 |
| Absent | 37 | 75 | 687 | 92 | |
| Present | 12 | 25 | 60 | 8 | |
| IDH1/2* | | | | | .03 |
| Wild-type | 26 | 68 | 452 | 83 | |
| Mutated | 12 | 32 | 92 | 17 | |
| CEBPA (CN-AML) | | | | | .10 |
| Wild-type | 32 | 97 | 396 | 86 | |
| Mutated | 1 | 3 | 64 | 14 | |
| Monoallelic | 1 | 3 | 22 | 5 | |
| Biallelic | 0 | | 42 | 9 | |
| WT1 (CN-AML) | | | | | .55 |
| Wild-type | 20 | 83 | 332 | 87 | |
| Mutated | 4 | 17 | 51 | 13 | |
| NRAS (CN-AML) | | | | | .60 |
| Wild-type | 23 | 82 | 356 | 85 | |
| Mutated | 5 | 18 | 63 | 15 | |

Abbreviations: AML, acute myeloid leukemia; APL, acute promyelocytic leukemia; FAB, French-American-British; ITD, internal tandem duplication; TKD, tyrosine kinase domain; PTD, partial tandem duplication; CN, cytogenetically normal.

*Analysis is restricted to AML HD98A trial.

†All cases, excluding core-binding factor leukemias.

‡All cases, excluding core-binding factor leukemias within noncomplex karyotype.

§All cases, excluding core-binding factor leukemias, within complex karyotype.

found between *RUNX1* and *FLT3*-TKD mutations (P = .42) or *FLT3*-ITD (P = .87) (Fig 1). Of note, presence of *FLT3*-ITD and *IDH* mutations concurrently with *RUNX1* mutations were mutually exclusive. Among CN-AML, *RUNX1* mutations in trend negatively correlated with *CEBPA* mutations (P = .10); the single case of *CEBPA* mutation had monoallelic mutation. There was no correlation with *WT1* (P = .55) or *NRAS* (P = .60) mutations.

Regarding presenting clinical characteristics, RUNX1 mutations were associated with FAB M0 (P = .04) and less frequently with FAB M2 (P = .03) morphology (Table 1). There was no significant differ-



Fig 1. Frequencies and distribution of the mutations of *IDH1/2*, *MLL*-PTD, *FLT3*, *NPM1*, and *CEBPA* in the *RUNX1*-mutated patients. Each *RUNX1*-mutated patient is represented by a blue column. PTD, partial tandem duplication; ITD, internal tandem duplication; TKD, mutation of the tyrosine kinase domain. *Missing mutation status of *MLL*-PTD; **one case with monoallelic *CEBPA* mutation.

ence in clinical characteristics according to exon involvement of the mutations (exons 3 to 5 ν exons 6 to 8) except for BM blasts (P = .071; Appendix Table A3; online only).

Response to Induction Therapy

For correlation with clinical outcome, 878 non-APL AML cases (missing follow-up data, n = 6) were considered. *RUNX1* mutations were associated with resistance to chemotherapy. Response to induction therapy was as follows: CR, 60.4% (32 of 53) and 73.4% (606 of 825; P = .055); refractory disease (RD), 30% and 19% (P = .047); early/hypoplastic death, 9% and 8% (P = .61) for *RUNX1*-mutated and *RUNX1*-wildtype AML, respectively. For the subgroup of CN-AML, there was in trend a difference between *RUNX1*-mutated and *RUNX1*-wild-type AML regarding CR rate (22 of 34 v 388 of 499; P = .09) and a significant difference in RD (10 of 32 v 77 of 499; P = .05).

In multivariable analysis, *RUNX1* mutation did not significantly impact achievement of CR, neither in the entire cohort nor in the subsets of intermediate-risk or CN-AML (data not shown). Significant variables for achievement of CR in the entire cohort were log WBC, age, *FLT3*-ITD, cytogenetic risk group, and *NPM1* mutations.

Survival Analysis

The median follow-up time for survival in the 878 non-APL patients with AML was 4.5 years (95% CI, 4.3 to 5.0); the estimated 4-year RFS and OS of the entire cohort were 43% (95% CI, 39% to 47%) and 44% (95% CI, 41% to 48%), respectively.

RUNX1 mutations were associated with inferior survival, the 4-year estimated survival rates for *RUNX1*-mutated and *RUNX1* wild-type patients were as follows: EFS, 8% versus 30% (log-rank,



Fig 2. Kaplan-Meier survival estimates, according to *RUNX1* mutation status. Data are shown for (A) event-free survival, (B) relapse-free survival, and (C) overall survival. wt, wild type; mut, mutated.

P < .0001); RFS, 26% versus 44% (P = .022); and OS, 32% versus 45% (P = .051), respectively (Fig 2). Among patients with CN-AML, *RUNX1* mutations predicted for inferior EFS, but no difference was found for RFS and OS: 4-year EFS, 10% versus 34% (log-rank, P < .0001); RFS, 29% versus 43% (P = .21); OS, 39% versus 50% (P = .09) for *RUNX1*-mutated and *RUNX1* wild-type patients, respectively.

Allogeneic hematopoietic stem-cell transplantation (HSCT) in first CR was performed in 14 (44%) of 32 *RUNX1*-mutated patients.



Fig 3. Kaplan-Meier survival estimates for relapse-free survival for all patients according to allogeneic hematopoietic stem-cell transplantation (allo-HSCT). Data are shown for *RUNX1*-mutated patients in whom allo-HSCT in first complete remission was performed or not. mut, mutated.

Of note, all 18 patients receiving repetitive cycles of high-dose cytarabine or autologous HSCT had an event in RFS (events: relapse, n = 17; death, n = 1), whereas in patients receiving allogeneic HSCT, eight of 14 were event-free (events: relapse, n = 2; death, n = 4). This translated into a significantly better RFS compared with the patients receiving conventional intensive postremission therapy (4-year RFS of 0% and 52% [log-rank, P < .0001], respectively; Fig 3). Of note, there was no significant difference in pretreatment patient characteristics between these two groups (Appendix Table A4, online only).

In multivariable analyses performed for all patients as well as for the subgroups of patients with intermediate-risk AML or CN-AML, *RUNX1* mutation was a significant marker for inferior EFS in the entire cohort (hazard ratio [HR], 1.494; P = .011) and in the intermediate-risk group (HR, 1.607; P = .005), but not in CN-AML (data not shown); there was no significant impact on RFS and OS (for the entire cohort see Table 2). However, in multivariable analyses of RFS censoring for allogeneic HSCT in first CR at the date of transplantation, *RUNX1* mutation again was a significant adverse factor (HR, 1.70; P = .04).

Finally, we performed explorative subgroup analyses in *RUNX1*mutated AML to evaluate the impact of additional *FLT3*-ITD, *MLL*-PTD, and *IDH1* and *IDH2* mutations. AML with *RUNX1* mutation and concurrent *FLT3*-ITD had an in trend inferior OS as compared with those without *FLT3*-ITD (18% v 37%; log-rank, P = .07). *MLL*-PTD and *IDH* mutations had no impact.

RUNX1 Mutation Cases Are Associated With a Distinct Gene Expression Pattern

Significance analysis of microarrays (SAM) revealed 148 genes differentially expressed between *RUNX1*-mutated (n = 14) and *RUNX1* wild-type cases (n = 255; false discovery rate, = 0.09; Data Supplement). Hierarchical cluster analysis based on the SAM-derived *RUNX1* mutation-associated signature (average linkage clustering; similarity metric: correlation, uncentered) showed that all 14 *RUNX1*mutated cases were in part characterized by the respective genes as they all grouped together in one cluster (Data Supplement). However, the deregulated gene pattern was not exclusive for *RUNX1*-mutated AML, with other AML cases also displaying a *RUNX1*-mutated–like

| Table 2. Multivariable Analyses for All Patients With AML (APL excluded) |
|--|
| Cox Regression Model on EFS, RFS, and OS Performed for the |
| Entire Cohort |

| End Point and Variable | HR | 95% CI | Ρ |
|--|--|--|--|
| EES | | | |
| EFS RUNX1 mutation Type of AML* Log ₁₀ WBC Log ₁₀ platelet MLL-PTD Age FLT3-ITD NPM1 mutation FLT3-TKD mutation BM blasts Cytogenetic adverse risk | 1.494 1.043 1.250 1.003 0.907 1.018 1.583 0.510 0.883 1.000 2.226 | 1.096 to 2.038 0.777 to 1.400 1.089 to 1.435 0.810 to 1.243 0.680 to 1.211 1.009 to 1.027 1.297 to 1.932 0.414 to 0.628 0.637 to 1.223 0.998 to 1.002 1.733 to 2.859 | .011 .778 .002 .975 .508 < .001 < .001 .453 .980 < .001 |
| Cytogenetic low risk | 0.472 | 0.333 to 0.670 | < .001 |
| RFS <i>RUNX1</i> mutation Type of AML* Log ₁₀ WBC Log ₁₀ platelet <i>MLL</i> -PTD Age <i>FLT3</i> -ITD <i>NPM1</i> mutation <i>FLT3</i> -TKD mutation BM blasts Cytogenetic adverse risk Cytogenetic low risk | 1.296 1.376 1.459 0.866 1.028 1.023 1.773 0.611 0.978 1.000 2.112 0.600 | 0.843 to 1.992 0.911 to 2.079 1.203 to 1.770 0.650 to 1.155 0.703 to 1.504 1.011 to 1.035 1.380 to 2.278 0.471 to 0.793 0.646 to 1.481 0.995 to 1.004 1.459 to 3.058 0.397 to 0.908 | .237 .129 < .001 .328 .887 < .001 < .001 < .001 .917 .844 < .001 .016 |
| RFS (allo-HSCT censored) <i>RUNX1</i> mutation Type of AML* Log ₁₀ WBC Log ₁₀ platelet <i>MLL</i> -PTD Age <i>FLT3</i> -ITD <i>NPM1</i> mutation <i>FLT3</i> -TKD mutation BM blasts Cytogenetic adverse risk Cytogenetic low risk | 1.712 2.086 1.416 0.868 1.239 1.016 2.040 0.540 0.971 1.001 1.372 0.543 | 1.027 to 2.853 1.228 to 3.543 1.129 to 1.777 0.616 to 1.223 0.777 to 1.978 1.003 to 1.031 1.505 to 2.763 0.394 to 0.740 0.613 to 1.539 0.996 to 1.007 0.790 to 2.384 0.349 to 0.846 | .039 .007 .002 .419 .368 .020 < .001 < .001 .902 .717 .262 .007 |
| OS <i>RUNX1</i> mutation Type of AML* Log ₁₀ WBC Log ₁₀ platelet <i>MLL</i> -PTD Age <i>FLT3</i> -ITD <i>NPM1</i> mutation <i>FLT3</i> -TKD mutation BM blasts Cytogenetic adverse risk Cytogenetic low risk | 1.077 1.448 1.448 0.931 1.032 1.038 1.751 0.752 0.756 1.000 2.591 0.463 | 0.755 to 1.535 1.059 to 1.979 1.238 to 1.693 0.736 to 1.177 0.748 to 1.424 1.027 to 1.048 1.406 to 2.181 0.595 to 0.950 0.516 to 1.107 0.998 to 1.002 1.988 to 3.376 0.301 to 0.713 | .684 .020 < .001 .551 .847 < .001 < .001 .017 .150 .682 < .001 .004 |

Abbreviations: AML, acute myeloid leukemia; APL, acute promyelocytic leukemia; EFS, event-free survival; RFS, relapse-free survival; OS, overall survival; HR, hazard ratio; PTD, partial tandem duplication; ITD, internal tandem duplication; TKD, tyrosine kinase domain; BM, bone marrow; allo-HSCT. allogeneic hematopoietic stem-cell transplantation.

*Type of AML: de novo AML, secondary AML, or treatment-related AML.

pattern (Data Supplement). Interestingly, the respective cluster was enriched for cytogenetic adverse-risk groups like cases with deletion 7q/monosomy 7 [del(7q)/-7], inv(3)/t(3,3) involving the *EVI1* gene, and AML cases with complex karyotypes, whereas the *RUNX1* wild-type cluster (cluster 2) contained almost all cases of inv(16), t(8;21), t(15;17), and t(11q23) (P < .0001, χ^2 test; Figs 4A to 4C). In accordance, the inverse association of *RUNX1* and *NPM1* mutations was also reflected at the gene expression level as the *RUNX1*-mutated/*RUNX1*-mutated–like cases were inversely correlated with *NPM1* mutations (P < .0001, Fisher's exact test).

To account for the cytogenetic and molecular heterogeneity of the *RUNX1*-mutated cases, we also performed a subgroup analysis within the *IDH*-mutated AML cases, which provided similar results as the SAM analysis across all cases (Data Supplementary). Furthermore, although the *RUNX1* mutation-associated signature was enriched for genes belonging to pathways associated with, for example, tumor necrosis factor signaling and apoptosis (Data Supplement), there was also a considerable overlap with pathways enriched in putative *RUNX1*-associated gene lists (Molecular Signatures Database MSigDBK, Data Supplement).

DISCUSSION

In our study of 945 unselected younger adult patients with AML derived from prospective multicenter treatment trials, *RUNX1* mutations were detected with an overall incidence of 5.6%. Mutations were associated with specific clinical and genetic characteristics and predicted for inferior survival.

The frequency of mutations was somewhat lower compared with the study by Tang et al^{22} (62 of 470, 13.2%) that is so far the only published study in a larger AML cohort. In part, this may be explained by patient selection; that is, in the Taiwanese study, all adult patients (15 to 90 years of age) were included, and patients with RUNX1 mutations were significantly older compared with those with wildtype RUNX1 (62 v 48 years, P = .01). In addition, in the Taiwanese study, a male predominance for RUNX1-mutated AML was described, which was not the case in our study. Besides patient selection, the racial background (white v Asian) may account for the observed differences in mutation frequencies and sex distribution. Similar to previous studies, we found a correlation with undifferentiated FAB M0 morphology and with intermediate-risk cytogenetics.²¹ In accordance with the study by Tang et al,²² RUNX1 mutations were somewhat less frequent in cytogenetic high-risk AML and did not occur in CBF-AML and APL. Among intermediate-risk AML, RUNX1 mutations were associated with normal karyotype and with trisomy 8 (occurring as sole abnormality or within a noncomplex karyotype). The previously reported association of RUNX1 mutations with trisomy 13 could not be evaluated in our study because there was only one case with trisomy 13 as sole aberration. Analogous to the study by Dicker et al,²¹ the majority of trisomy 13 cases occurring in a complex karyotype had wild-type RUNX1. With regard to the correlation with other molecular makers, we observed a significant correlation of RUNX1 mutations with MLL-PTD and IDH mutations and an inverse correlation with NPM1 and CEBPA mutations (Fig 1). These data suggest that RUNX1 mutations contribute to leukemogenesis by other mechanisms than do NPM1 and CEBPA mutations.

Gaidzik et al



Fig 4. Hierarchical cluster analysis on the basis of the significance analysis of microarrays (SAM) – derived *RUNX1* mutation–associated signature. (A) Comparison of the distribution of cytogenetic subgroups within the hierarchical cluster analysis defined clusters (Data Supplement). Cytogenetic adverse-risk groups with deletion 7q or monosomy 7 [del(7q)/-7] and with inv(3) or t(3;3) were significantly enriched in the *RUNX1* mutation–associated cluster 1 (P < .0001, χ^2 test). (B and C) The proportion of AML cases with complex karyotypes (indicated in gray) was significantly higher in (B) the *RUNX1*-mutation–associated cluster 1, whereas almost all inv(16), t(8;21), t(15;17), and t(11q23) cases were present in (C) the *RUNX1*-wild-type–associated cluster 2. mut, mutated; wt, wild-type.

In our study, RUNX1 mutations were significantly associated with resistance to induction chemotherapy; rates of RD were 30% and 18% for RUNX1-mutated and RUNX1 wild-type AML, respectively. In univariable analysis, RUNX1-mutations predicted for inferior EFS, RFS, and OS. In the subset of patients with CN-AML, RUNX1 mutations only predicted for inferior EFS, but not for inferior RFS and OS. Explorative subset analyses showed that concurrent FLT3-ITD may negatively impact OS in RUNX1-mutated AML, whereas there was no effect of additional MLL-PTD or IDH1 and IDH2 mutations. Of note, allogeneic HSCT had a favorable impact on outcome in RUNX1mutated AML. In fact, all RUNX1-mutated patients relapsed after conventional consolidation therapy including repetitive cycles of high-dose cytarabine and autologous HSCT, whereas the 4-year RFS after allogeneic HSCT was 52% (Fig 3). In multivariable analysis, RUNX1 mutation was a significant factor for EFS in the entire cohort as well as in the subgroup of cytogenetically intermediate-risk patients. The effect was also significant for RFS, but not OS, if allogeneic HSCT in first CR was censored at the date of transplantation. These data are somewhat in contrast to those by Tang et al,²² who found RUNX1 mutations to be a significant factor also for inferior OS. In part, this difference may be explained by the fact that in that study older patients were included, and the proportion of patients receiving allogeneic HSCT was lower. Because RUNX1 mutations occur with a relatively low incidence, it is difficult to show its prognostic impact, especially within the context of well-established strong prognostic molecular markers. In addition, the impact of allogeneic HSCT further complicated the evaluation as a prognostic marker by reducing the sample size after censoring patients who underwent transplantation.

GEP analysis also provided evidence that RUNX1-mutated AML shares a distinct biology that overlaps with other high-risk AML. In agreement, a recent analysis showed an enrichment of RUNX1-mutated cases in a cohort of AML comprising complex karyotype AML and cases with del(7q)/-7 as well as EVI1 rearrangements.⁴² Thus

aberrations of *RUNX1*, *EVI1*, and yet unknown molecular mechanisms share the deregulation of identical pathways and thus might present with a similar phenotype. Here, *RUNX1* mutations seem to contribute significantly, as the respective gene pattern contained genes known to be associated with *RUNX1* aberrations in leukemia such as *BAALC*, a gene also highly expressed in t(8;21) AML,^{43,44} and *MET*, a proto-oncogene that has been linked to *ETV6-RUNX1* rearrangements.⁴⁵ Finally, deregulated expression of apoptotic pathway members were another prominent feature, suggesting that altered regulation of apoptosis, exemplified by higher expression levels of *BCL2L1* (*BCL2-like 1*, also known as *Bcl-X* or *Bcl-XL*), might play an important role in the *RUNX1*-mutated subgroup.⁴⁶

In conclusion, the findings of our study further strengthen the data that *RUNX1* mutations are characterized by distinct biologic and clinical features. In accordance, this AML subgroup shows almost no overlap with other genetic subsets (eg, defined by *NPM1* mutations). Clinically, *RUNX1* mutations predict for resistance to chemotherapy. Given the available data, *RUNX1* mutational status should not be integrated into therapeutic decision making. Further studies with a focus on intermediate-risk AML are needed to evaluate the predictive impact of *RUNX1* mutations for allogeneic HSCT.

AUTHORS' DISCLOSURES OF POTENTIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The author(s) indicated no potential conflicts of interest.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Conception and design: Verena I. Gaidzik, Lars Bullinger, Richard F. Schlenk, Hartmut Döhner, Konstanze Döhner **Financial support:** Richard F. Schlenk, Hartmut Döhner, Konstanze Döhner

Administrative support: Konstanze Döhner

Provision of study materials or patients: Richard F. Schlenk, Jürgen Krauter, Arnold Ganser, Andrea Kündgen, Ingo G. H. Schmidt-Wolf, Katharina Götze, David Nachbaur, Michael Pfreundschuh, Heinz A. Horst, Hartmut Döhner, Konstanze Döhner

Collection and assembly of data: Verena I. Gaidzik, Lars Bullinger, Richard F. Schlenk, Andreas S. Zimmermann, Jürgen Röck, Peter Paschka, Andrea Corbacioglu, Jürgen Krauter, Brigitte Schlegelberger, Arnold Ganser, Daniela Späth, Andrea Kündgen, Ingo G. H. Schmidt-Wolf, Katharina Götze, David Nachbaur, Michael Pfreundschuh, Heinz A. Horst, Hartmut Döhner, Konstanze Döhner **Data analysis and interpretation:** Verena I. Gaidzik, Lars Bullinger, Richard F. Schlenk, Andreas S. Zimmermann, Jürgen Röck, Hartmut Döhner, Konstanze Döhner

REFERENCES

1. Döhner K, Döhner H: Molecular characterization of acute myeloid leukemia. Haematologica 93: 976-982, 2008

2. Mrózek K, Marcucci G, Paschka P, et al: Clinical relevance of mutations and gene-expression changes in adult acute myeloid leukemia with normal cytogenetics: Are we ready for a prognostically prioritized molecular classification? Blood 109:431-448, 2007

3. Gaidzik V, Döhner K: Prognostic implications of gene mutations in acute myeloid leukemia with normal cytogenetics. Semin Oncol 35:346-355, 2008

 Mardis ER, Ding L, Dooling DJ, et al: Recurring mutations found by sequencing an acute myeloid leukemia genome. N Engl J Med 361: 1058-1066, 2009

5. Marcucci G, Maharry K, Wu YZ, et al: *IDH1* and *IDH2* gene mutations identify novel molecular subsets within de novo cytogenetically normal acute myeloid leukemia: A Cancer and Leukemia Group B Study. J Clin Oncol 28:2348-2355, 2010

6. Paschka P, Schlenk RF, Gaidzik VI, et al: *IDH1* and *IDH2* mutations are frequent genetic alterations in acute myeloid leukemia (AML) and confer adverse prognosis in cytogenetically normal AML with *NPM1* mutation without *FLT3*-ITD. J Clin Oncol 28:3636-3643, 2010

7. Wagner K, Damm F, Göhring G, et al: Impact of IDH1 R132 mutations and an IDH1 single nucleotide polymorphism in cytogenetically normal acute myeloid leukemia: SNP rs11554137 is an adverse prognostic factor. J Clin Oncol 28:2356-2364, 2010

8. Thol F, Damm F, Wagner K, et al: Prognostic impact of IDH2 mutations in cytogenetically normal acute myeloid leukemia. Blood 116:614-616, 2010

9. Döhner H, Estey EH, Amadori S, et al: Diagnosis and management of acute myeloid leukemia in adults: Recommendations from an international expert panel, on behalf of the European Leukemia Net. Blood 115:453-474, 2010

10. Schlenk RF, Döhner K, Krauter J, et al: Mutations and treatment outcome in cytogenetically normal acute myeloid leukemia. N Engl J Med 358: 1909-1918, 2008

11. Bullinger L, Döhner K, Bair E, et al: Use of gene-expression profiling to identify prognostic subclasses in adult acute myeloid leukemia. N Engl J Med 350:1605-1616, 2004

12. Valk PJM, Verhaak RGW, Beijen MA, et al: Prognostically useful gene-expression profiles in acute myeloid leukemia. N Engl J Med 350:1617-1628, 2004 Schlenk, Andreas S. Zimmermann, Jürgen Röck, Peter Paschka, Andrea Corbacioglu, Jürgen Krauter, Brigitte Schlegelberger, Arnold Ganser, Daniela Späth, Andrea Kündgen, Ingo G. H. Schmidt-Wolf, Katharina Götze, David Nachbaur, Michael Pfreundschuh, Heinz A. Horst, Hartmut Döhner, Konstanze Döhner

Manuscript writing: Verena I. Gaidzik, Lars Bullinger, Richard F.

Final approval of manuscript: Verena I. Gaidzik, Lars Bullinger, Richard F. Schlenk, Andreas S. Zimmermann,

Jürgen Röck, Peter Paschka, Andrea Corbacioglu, Jürgen Krauter, Brigitte Schlegelberger, Arnold Ganser, Daniela Späth, Andrea Kündgen, Ingo G. H. Schmidt-Wolf, Katharina Götze, David Nachbaur, Michael Pfreundschuh, Heinz A. Horst, Hartmut Döhner, Konstanze Döhner

13. Baldus CD, Bullinger L: Gene expression with prognostic implications in cytogenetically normal acute myeloid leukemia. Semin Oncol 35:356-364, 2008

14. Ito Y: Oncogenic potential of the RUNX gene family: 'Overview'. Oncogene 23:4198-4208, 2004

15. Chen J, Odenike O, Rowley JD: Leukaemogenesis: More than mutant genes. Nat Rev Cancer 10:23-36, 2010

16. Osato M, Asou N, Abdalla E, et al: Biallelic and heterozygous point mutations in the runt domain of the AML1/PEBP2alphaB gene associated with myeloblastic leukemias. Blood 93:1817-1824, 1999

17. Preudhomme C, Warot-Loze D, Roumier C, et al: High incidence of biallelic point mutations in the Runt domain of the AML1/PEBP2 alpha B gene in M0 acute myeloid leukemia and in myeloid malignancies with acquired trisomy 21. Blood 96:2862-2869, 2000

18. Taketani T, Taki T, Takita J, et al: AML1/ RUNX1 mutations are infrequent, but related to AML-M0, acquired trisomy 21, and leukemic transformation in pediatric hematologic malignancies. Genes Chromosomes Cancer 38:1-7, 2003

19. Matsuno N, Osato M, Yamashita N, et al: Dual mutations in the AML1 and FLT3 genes are associated with leukemogenesis in acute myeloblastic leukemia of the M0 subtype. Leukemia 17:2492-2499, 2003

20. Harada H, Harada Y, Niimi H, et al: High incidence of somatic mutations in the *AML1/RUNX1* gene in myelodysplastic syndrome and low blast percentage myeloid leukemia with myelodysplasia. Blood 103:2316-2324, 2004

21. Dicker F, Haferlach C, Kern W, et al: Trisomy 13 is strongly associated with *AML1/RUNX1* mutations and increased *FLT3* expression in acute myeloid leukemia. Blood 110:1308-1316, 2007

22. Tang JL, Hou HA, Chen CY, et al: *AML1/ RUNX1* mutations in 470 adult patients with de novo acute myeloid leukemia: Prognostic implication and interaction with other gene alterations. Blood 114: 5352-5361, 2009

23. Swerdlow SH, Campo E, Harris NL, et al: WHO Classification of Tumours of Haematopoietic and Lymphoid Tissues. Lyon, France, IARC Press, 2008

24. Song WJ, Sullivan MG, Legare RD, et al: Haploinsiufficiency of *CBFA2* causes familial thrombocytopenia with propensity to develop acute myelogenous leukemia. Nat Genet 23:166-175, 1999

25. Owen CJ, Toze CL, Koochin A, et al: Five new pedigrees with inherited *RUNX1* mutations causing familial platelet disorder with propensity to myeloid malignancy (FPD/AML). Blood 112: 4639-4645, 2008

26. Taniuchi I, Littman DR: Epigenetic gene silencing by Runx proteins. Oncogene 23:4341-4345, 2004

27. Schlenk RF, Germing U, Hartmann F, et al: High-dose cytarabine and mitoxantrone in consolidation therapy for acute promyelocytic leukemia. Leukemia 19:978-983, 2005

28. Gaidzik VI, Schlenk RF, Moschny S, et al: Prognostic impact of *WT1* mutations in cytogenetically normal acute myeloid leukemia: A study of the German-Austrian AML Study Group. Blood 113: 4505-4511, 2009

29. National Center for Biotechnology Information: Entrez SNP. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/sites/snp

30. University of California Santa Cruz: Human (Homo sapiens) Genome Browser Gateway. http://genome.ucsc.edu/cgi-bin/hgGateway

31. Ensembl Genome Browser. http://www .ensembl.org/Homo_sapiens-/Gene/Variation_Gene

32. Bullinger L, Döhner K, Kranz R, et al: An *FLT3* gene-expression signature predicts clinical outcome in normal karyotype AML. Blood 111:4490-4495, 2008

33. Tusher VG, Tibshirani R, Chu G: Significance analysis of microarrays applied to the ionizing radiation response. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 98:5116-5121, 2001

34. Eisen MB, Spellman PT, Brown PO, et al: Cluster analysis and display of genome-wide expression patterns. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 95:14863-14868, 1998

35. Lück SC, Russ AC, Du J, et al: *KIT* mutations confer a distinct gene expression signature in core binding factor leukaemia. Br J Haematol 148:925-937, 2010

36. Korn EL: Censoring distributions as a measure of follow-up in survival analysis. Stat Med 5:255-260, 1986

37. Kaplan E, Meier P: Nonparametric estimation from incomplete observations. J Am Stat Assoc 53:457-481, 1958

38. Therneau TM, Grambusch PM: Modeling Survival Data: Extending the Cox Model. New York, NY, Springer Verlag, 2000

39. Cox DR: Regression models and life tables (with discussion). J R Stat Soc B 34:187-220, 1972

40. Harrell FE: Regression Modeling Strategies: With Applications to Linear Models, Logistic Regression, and Survival Analysis. New York, NY, Springer Verlag, 2001

41. R Development Core Team. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria, R Foundation for Statistical Computing, 2009

42. Langabeer SE, Gale RE, Rollinson SJ, et al: Mutations of the *AML1* gene in acute myeloid leukemia of FAB types M0 and M7. Genes Chromosomes Cancer 34:24-32, 2002

Gaidzik et al

43. Tanner SM, Austin JL, Leone G, et al: BAALC, the human member of a novel mammalian neuroectoderm gene lineage, is implicated in hematopoiesis and acute leukemia. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 98:13901-13906, 2001

44. Dunne J, Cullmann C, Ritter M, et al: SiRNAmediated AML1/MTG8 depletion affects differentiation and proliferation-associated gene expression in t(8;21)-positive cell lines and primary AML blasts. Oncogene 25:6067-6078, 2006

45. Accordi B, Pillozzi S, Dell'Orto MC, et al: Hepatocyte growth factor receptor c-MET is associated with FAS and when activated enhances druginduced apoptosis in pediatric B acute lymphoblastic leukemia with *TEL-AML1* translocation. J Biol Chem 282:29384-29393, 2007

46. Schaich M, Illmer T, Seitz G, et al: The prognostic value of BcI-XL gene expression for remission induction is influenced by cytogenetics in adult acute myeloid leukemia. Haematologica 86:470-477, 2001

Now Available on Kindle: JCO's Art of Oncology

Art of Oncology: Honest and Compassionate Responses to the Daily Struggles of People Living with Cancer, edited by Charles L. Loprinzi, MD, has just been published as a Kindle e-book. Art of Oncology is a collection of 30 brief articles that first appeared in Journal of Clinical Oncology. The essays address issues related to end-of-life care, symptom control, ethics, and communication with patients.

In these heartfelt pieces, doctors reveal how they respond to the personal needs of people with cancer; how to be honest with patients about their condition; how to be realistic but simultaneously hopeful; and how to answer the difficult question of "How much time do I have left?"

Art of Oncology is available only as a Kindle e-book and can be purchased for \$6.99 at www.jco.org/kindle

ASCOS[®] American Society of Clinical Oncology